

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

- Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, and 11-13 are pending in the Application.
- Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, and 11-13 are rejected by Examiner.
- Claims 1 and 6 are currently amended.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Profibus Technical Description Order No. 4.002, September 1999, (Profibus) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,073,244 to Iwazaki. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Pending Claims 1 and 6 are amended to clarify the difference between the current invention and the cited art. Claim 1 is amended to include the aspect that two clocks are present in the claims; one is a system clock and the other is a data transmission clock. As amended, Claim 1 recites that the data transmission clock signal is derived from a system clock signal available to the central IC. Claim 1 is also amended to present the aspect that a start pulse is transmitted on the control line with a rising edge of the system clock signal during an active high state of the data transmission clock signal present on the clock line and wherein the transfer pulse is transmitted on the control line with a rising edge of the system clock signal when the data transmission clock signal is absent on the clock line. Independent Claim 6 is likewise amended. Applicant finds support for the amendments in Figure 3 and the text of page 7 line 30 to page 8 line 2 plus the description on page 9, lines 3 to 11.

In reviewing the cited art of Profibus and Iwazaki, Applicant respectfully submits that both Profibus and Iwazaki teach that a continuous clock is required for proper operation of the Profibus and Iwazaki configurations. Profibus and Iwazaki, considered in combination with each other, fail to teach or suggest the amended Claim 1 and Claim 6 aspects of a start pulse that is transmitted on the control line with a rising edge of the system clock signal during an active high state of the data transmission

clock signal present on the clock line and wherein the transfer pulse is transmitted on the control line with a rising edge of the system clock signal when the data transmission clock signal is absent on the clock line.

Applicant thus concludes the combination of Profibus and Iwazaki cannot form a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 USC §103(a) because the cited reference combination fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent Claims 1 and 6. Claims 4 and 9 are dependent on patentably distinct Claims 1 and 6 respectively and thus are also rendered non-obvious under 35 USC §103(a) per MPEP §2143.03.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejections on Claims 1, 4, 6, and 9 in light of the arguments presented above.

Claims 11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Profibus Technical Description Order No. 4.002, September 1999, (Profibus) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,073,244 to Iwazaki and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,120,427 to Adams et al. (Adams). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection via amendment of independent Claim 6.

Applicant notes that the combination of Profibus and Iwazaki fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness against pending amended independent Claim 6, upon which Claims 11-13 depend, because the combination of Profibus and Iwazaki fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent Claim 6. The addition of Adams to the combination of Profibus and Iwazaki does not change that result. Adams fails to teach the elements missing from the combination of Profibus and Iwazaki. Accordingly, Claims 11-13 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Profibus, Iwazaki, and Adams per MPEP §2143.03.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejections on Claims 11-13 in light of the amendment to independent Claim 6 and the arguments presented above.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims patentably define over the cited art and respectfully requests continued examination and a reconsideration of all rejections of the pending claims.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0832 therefore.

Respectfully submitted,
Heizmann et al.

Date: January 11, 2010

/Jerome G. Schaefer/

Jerome G. Schaefer
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 50,800
(609) 734-6451

Thomson Licensing, LLC
Patent Operation
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312